

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/089,118	KITAGAWA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Blanche Wong	2616	

All Participants:
Status of Application: _____

 (1) Blanche Wong.

(3) _____.

 (2) James E. Ledbetter.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 17 May 2007
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

25,30-32

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet
Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: In claims 25,30 and 31, the phrase "said regenerator uses" should be "said regenerator uses a signal" that is being replaced. The limitation in claims 25, 30 and 31, should recite "said signal for suppressing peak power whose amplitude is quasi-zero". In claim 32, the phrase "said regeneration" should be "said regeneration uses a signal" that is being replaced. The limitation in claim 32 should recite "said signal for suppressing peak power whose amplitude is quasi-zero".